

that he who would claim to be "Bishop of Bishops" would be the forerunner of anti-christ.

Gregory the Great has left his mark deep on our English Church history, by his mission of Augustine, which led to the conversion to Christ of the realm of Kent and to the founding of the primatial See of Canterbury; he has left his mark deep on our English Church music, for who has not heard of the Gregorian chants? and he has left his mark deep also on our English Book of Common Prayer: no less than thirty out of the ninety-eight Collects now under consideration may be traced, in whole or in part, to the Sacramentary of Gregory. To his pen we owe also other prayers in our Prayer Book, which are not called Collects. The short prayer which begins "O God, whose nature and property is ever to have mercy and to forgive;" the final prayer in the Litany; the second prayer in the Baptismal Office; and the first sentence of the first prayer in the Burial Service.

There is one other ancient source of our Collects, purely English in its character, to which we owe "the constant Collect," and through which our translated Collects have come from the Sacramentaries of Leo, Gelasius and Gregory. Its consideration must be reserved for the second paper in this series.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A Paper read by the REV. D. SMITH at a Rural Deanery Meeting, held at Cow Bay, on St. Luke's Day, 1881.

(Continued.)

The alterations in the text may be divided into three classes—omissions, the marking or bracketing of passages as doubtful, and changes.

A. The doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, Matthew vi., 13; the question of the eunuch and the answer of Philip, Acts viii. 37; and the celebrated passage about the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7, 8,—are the most important omissions; and, reluctant as we may be to surrender the passages, their retention cannot be justified by any principles of criticism. The doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer is found in none of the earliest and most important MSS., the only* Uncial MS. in which it is contained (L) being of the 8th century. It is absent from the Latin Versions. The Greek and Latin Fathers generally omit it, even when they expound the Lord's Prayer in detail. It rests chiefly on the authority of the two Syriac Versions (and even this is said to be doubtful), and most of the Cursive MSS. Dean Alford's explanation is that it has been interpolated from the Liturgies. The passage in Acts viii. 37 if found in some of the Versions, including the Vulgate as authorized by Clement VIII. in 1592, and is quoted as Scripture by some of the Fathers. But the manuscript authority is overwhelmingly against it; and it is not contained in the Codex Amiatinus, the most ancient and important MS. of the Vulgate of St. Jerome. The probability is that it was interpolated very early. Alford says "the interpolation seems to have been made to suit the formularies of the Baptismal Liturgies, it being considered strange that the eunuch should have been baptized without some such confession." The last of the omissions which I have mentioned, 1 John v. 7, 8, was almost universally acknowledged to be inevitable. The passage is contained in no MS. of an earlier date than the 15th century. The exact number of MSS. which contain the chapter is not known. It is not less than one hundred and seventy-five, and possibly as many as two hundred and fifty. And of those only two, and these of the 15th and 16th century, can be adduced as containing the passage. It is found, indeed, in four other MSS. But two of these were made from the printed text, and must, therefore, be rejected; while the other two have the addition only in the margin. The Vulgate is sometimes appealed to in support of it; but while it is found in the later MSS. of that Version, it is wanting in the earlier. All the Versions, therefore, are against it. It is quoted by none of the Greek Fathers, even when bringing forth proofs of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. It has rested for its authority on some of the Latin Fathers; but even their testimony is said to be greatly shaken on examination.

As specimens of other omissions, interesting, but of no doctrinal importance, I may mention, "Bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you"

which despitely use you," St. Matt. v. 44, a passage which we should be sorry to lose if the precept was not found in St. Luke vi. 27, 28; the "woe" against the Scribes and Pharisees, St. Matthew xxiii. 14, which is probably an interpolation from St. Mark xii. 40, and St. Luke xx. 47; the words, "and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, and he was numbered with the transgressors," Mark xv. 28, which is supposed to have found its way into the margin from Luke xxii. 37, and been introduced thence into the text; and the passage in St. John v. 3, 4, about the descent of the angel and the troubling of the waters in the pool of Bethesda. The first of these passages is omitted without a word of explanation. The others are relegated to the margin, in one case with the remark that some ancient authorities, and in the other cases many ancient authorities insert them.

B. The two important passages marked as doubtful are the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel, and the passage about the woman taken in adultery, John vii. 53, viii. 11. The bracketing of the latter is fully warranted by the evidence, which is thus summarized in the marginal note: "Most of the ancient authorities omit John vii. 53, viii. 11. Those which contain it vary much from each other." Most critics and commentators agree that the narrative, although not part of St. John's Gospel, is historically true. But with all due deference to the Revisers, I am not certain that the evidence is so decidedly against the last twelve verses of St. Mark, that they should be separated from the rest of the chapter with the marginal note: "The two oldest Greek MSS. and some other authorities omit verse 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel." To many readers wholly ignorant of textual criticism this testimony, it seems to me, would appear more decisive than it really is. "The two oldest Greek MSS." are the Vatican (B), and the Sinaitic (Aleph). But the passage is found in the three MSS. next to them in age and importance—the Codex Alexandrinus (A), the Codex Ephraemi (C), and the Codex Bezae (D). It is found also in most of the Versions; and is cited by many of the Fathers, amongst them Irenaeus, who wrote about A. D. 178. On the other hand, Jerome says that it was not contained in most of the MSS. in his time, and Eusebius speaks to the same effect. It is also claimed that the internal evidence is against its genuineness, no less than twenty-one words and expressions occurring in it which are not used elsewhere by St. Mark. The internal evidence in favour of it rests principally on the "ephobounto gar" (for they were afraid) with which the eighth verse ends. "This note of fear," says Bishop Wordsworth, "is very unlike the consummation of the Gospel, which communicates glad tidings of great joy." On the whole, it seems to me, that the exigencies of the case would have been met by simply adding the marginal note, without further emphasizing the doubt by separating the passage from the rest of the chapter.

(Since our Rural Deanery Meeting I have read that portion of Dr. Robert's "Companion to the Revised Version of the New Testament," which deals with this passage. But it does not lead me to modify what I have written. While acknowledging the difficulty of deciding, his own view (and that of the majority of the Revisers) is, that the verses were added by some one immediately connected with the Apostles, and are possessed of Canonical authority. And they are, he tells us, inserted by the Revisers as an Appendix to the Gospel. Well, I pass by the questions suggested by this explanation, and content myself with saying that the marginal note does not give any indication that this was the meaning of the separation from the context.)

C. I pass next to the changes in the English Version consequent on parallel changes which the Revisers have felt it their duty to make in the Greek Text. The most important of these is, as is well known, the substitution of "He who" for "God" in 1 Timothy iii. 16. Two-thirds of the Revisers must have approved of these changes. But the true reading (whether *Theos*, God, Hos, Who, or Ho, which) is, after all, very doubtful; so much so that I am almost disposed to agree with the Reviewer in the London Guardian of June 15th, who would "have thought it better to leave the text unaltered, and to be contented to state alternatives in the margin." As I purpose presently to proceed to a more particular examination of two Books of the New Testament, I will at present refer to only three more changes. The first of these will be regretted chiefly on account of old

associations—"peace among men in whom he is well pleased." The change in the original is confined to a single letter, "*en anthropois eudokias*" for "*en anthropois eudokia*," and although the old reading is strongly supported, the ascertained readings of the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. have decided against it. Keble, you will remember, adopts the reading favoured by the Revisers in his beautiful hymn for Christmas Day, but with the Roman Catholic rendering, i. e., taking "eudokias" as the subjective genitive, "men of (possessing) good will," instead of objective "men of (objects of) good will," "men in whom he is well pleased."

Like circles widening round
Upon a clear blue river,
Orb after orb, the wondrous sound
Is echoed on for ever:

"Glory to God on high, on earth be peace,
And love towards men of love—salvation and release."

The next change is in 1 Peter iii. 15, where in place of "Sanctifying the Lord God in your hearts," the Revised Version has "Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord," a change clearly required both by textual criticism and grammatical accuracy, and adding one more testimony to the Divinity of Christ. The last that I will notice is in Revelation xxii. 14—"Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life;" where the Authorized Version reads, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right unto the tree of life." The change is very striking, and will seem to most of us as more in harmony with the spirit of the Gospel. "Not our own righteousness," but His "most precious blood." The Greek readings are, "*plunontes tas stolai autou*," and "*poiontes tas entolas autou*." Whichever is the true reading, it is easy to see how the error has been made in transcribing by some early copyist. To me it is rather surprising that the Revisers seem not to have thought the change "of sufficient interest or importance to deserve notice;" there is no allusion to it in the margin, although the preponderance of evidence in favour of the reading adopted is very small indeed.

Perhaps it may be worth while in this connection to call your attention to 1 John ii. 23. The latter part of the verse is printed in italics in the Authorized Version to indicate that the translators thought it of doubtful authority. The "Textus Receptus" omits the words altogether. But in the Revised Version they are inserted in the text without italics, mark, or comment. And the evidence for them is so overwhelming, that I cannot conceive why they were left out of the Textus Receptus, or marked as doubtful in the Authorized Version.

*The MSS. of the Greek Testament are of two classes—Uncials and Cursives. The Uncials, as the name denotes, are written in capital letters, and are of much earlier date than the Cursives. The oldest Uncial MS. is of the 4th century; the oldest Cursive of the 9th.

MISSION WORK.

In seeking the good of the Indians, the churches as a rule do not encroach on one another's ground. In mission work among the Indians, the Roman Catholic, the Episcopalian, and the Methodist Churches have the most honorable record. The Presbyterian Church has done comparatively little. Its missions to the Indians are confined to three bands, and I think it could not now extend its work without interfering with the work of other churches, a course from which it has always abstained. The Methodists have strong missions on both sides of Lake Winnipeg, and along the Nelson River, besides their great Saskatchewan field. In all these missions they are undisturbed by the rivalry of other churches. The missionaries of the Episcopal Church are to be found round the shores of Hudson Bay, and as far west and north as the Hudson River. Bishop Machray told me to-day of boys who had recently come from the Mackenzie, three thousand miles distant, to attend St. John's school. What a conception that statement gives us of the vastness of Canada.

We think that Winnipeg is far north and west; but boys who have travelled three thousand miles south and east, every mile of it in Canada, have got only as far as Winnipeg! Probably their parents cannot conceive of a city farther east. To them Winnipeg must be at the gateways of the day. Bishop Machray's diocese once extended over the whole North-West. It is now divided into four—Rupert's Land, with some thirty clergymen, one-third of these being missionaries to the Indians; and Moosonee, Saskatchewan, and Athabasca, with about twenty clergymen, almost all of them more or less engaged in mission work among the Indians and half-breeds. Of course, this extensive mission work is carried on chiefly, if not altogether, at the cost of the parent Church in England. What Church is certainly doing its duty nobly so far as the Indians are concerned.—Principal Grant.

Correspondence.

RITUALISM.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—In your leader of last week, entitled "Ritualism and Romanism," I notice the expression—"the extremes practiced by a few of the younger clergy." I think you are scarcely right in saying that the younger clergy in England are the extreme men. The same charge has been made over and over again, by Evangelical newspapers at home, and has been as often disproved by the *Church Times*, and other papers. Of the champions of the Ritual cause, nearly all, if not entirely all, have been men of advanced age. I may just give the names of Canon Carter, Mr. Lowder, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Dale, Archdeacon Dennison, and Dr. Neale. Nor are Messrs. Machonochie, Enraght, and Green, young men. Your remarks are, however, likely to remove misapprehensions; and if you will allow me, as one who has been much interested in the Ritual movement, and who is able to appreciate its merits, as well as to note its defects, I will supplement your leader with a few words concerning the Ritualists as regards their loyalty to the Church. It is not too much to say that the so-called Ritualists are, as a body, most truly loyal to the Church of England, as a branch of the Church Catholic. They have proved themselves to be. Except the Rev. Orby Shipley, who was never a trusted man; no Ritualist clergyman of note and learning has gone to Rome. The great body of men who went over in Tractarian times were certainly not Ritualists. Doctrine was the rock on which they found shipwreck, and because the Church of England repudiated them, and they were not brave enough to stay within her fold and fight the battles, they drifted away. In these latter times, the Ritualists are upholding the Church cause against Rome on the one hand, and against State encroachments on the other. Dr. Littledale's book is acknowledged to be the most powerful weapon of defence against Rome that the Church has ever had. In it the true Catholicity of England is proved, and the false Catholicity of Rome unanswerably shown. The Ritualists have shown us how we may have a Service with a pure Catholic Ritual, and so they win, and keep those whose instincts and education lead them to love a ceremonious and symbolic form of worship. The clergy also, who have lately been incarcerated, have done a work for the Church which posterity will hold in grateful remembrance. The Erastianism in the Church was beginning to make her a "very scorn of men." No intelligent person can fail to see that the Church has spiritual rights which the State cannot control. The civil courts cannot summon and judge, rightly, the priests of the Church for ecclesiastical offences. Therefore the Clergy who have gone to jail have done so in defence of the rights of the Church. They are willing to "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's," but cannot render to him the "things which are God's." It is almost needless to say that their punishment was imposed because they would not accept judgments which contradicted a plain and unambiguous rubric of the Prayer Book. I have hardly space to say in conclusion, that there is a small party among the extreme men which is undoubtedly false to the Church. It is called the "Order of Corporate Reunion." Its scheme is briefly this:—Its officers profess to have received re-ordination from Rome and other quarters. To any who doubt their orders in the English Church, they offer to impart what they call valid ones. This party is very small, and is the subject of much ridicule from both sides. Very little has been heard from it of late, and it is likely, owing to the healthier tone which Ritualism has taken of late, to entirely disappear.

Apologising for taking up so much of your valuable space,

I remain,

Yours truly,

"CATHOLICUS."

P. S.—The *Church Times*, the organ of the Ritualists, has condemned the O. C. R. in most severe terms.

FREDERICKTON D. C. S.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—In the GUARDIAN of the 10th inst., you give a list of Parishes in the Diocese of Fredericton that have raised during the year \$600 over all Church purposes, but you do not include the Parish of Burton, in which, as will be seen by the Rector's Report, a Glebe has been purchased for the sum of \$1400. Of this amount, \$380 has been collected in the Parish during the year, which, with the quota to the Rector's stipend and contribution to the D. C. S., make up a total of \$828.44. The Church people are few, and consequently, nine-tenths of this sum has been paid in by fifteen Parishioners, the majority of whom are farmers, and by no means wealthy. Those of your readers who reside in Country Parishes will readily understand that sacrifices have been made in order to achieve this result. I make this explanation, as an act of justice to the Parish in question, and, knowing also that you take a deep interest in the progressive work of the Church in this Diocese.

Yours, &c. PARISHIONER.